



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/332,263	06/11/1999	MICHAEL C. ADLER	5231.8-4015	2707

7590 06/19/2003
DAVID E. BOUNDY
SCHULTE ROTH & ZABEL
919 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

TANG, KENNETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2127

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PR4

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/332,263	Applicant(s) ADLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Kenneth Tang	Art Unit 2127	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 June 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2,3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Application 09/332263 was filed on 6/11/99. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Grammatical error: "effect" should be "affect".

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "number of bits used to record the event code is less than \log_2 of the number of distinguished event classes", "identify all bytes of object code executed during the profiled interval, without reference to the binary code", "non-initiating events" and "profile circuitry being configured to record at least one physical memory reference noting the source and destination of a control flow event in which control flow of the

Art Unit: 2127

program execution diverges from sequential execution" must be shown or the features canceled from the claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 20 and 23. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. **The term "efficiently" in claim 6 is a relative term** which renders the claim indefinite.

The term "efficiently" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

6. **The term "at least all" in claims 3 and 8 is a relative term** which renders the claim indefinite. The term "at least all" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2127

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-6, 10-11, 14, 17, 19-20, 22, 24-25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

102(e) as being unpatentable over Chernoff et al. (hereinafter Chernoff) (US 6,000,028).

7. Referring to claim 1, Chernoff teaches a computer, comprising:

- an instruction pipeline configured to execute instructions of the computer (*"pipeline instructions and thus execute the application program more quickly and efficiently"*, col. 20, lines 9-11, *"pipelined fashion, executing multiple instructions in parallel"*, col. 19, lines 45-46);
- profile circuitry configured to detect and record, without compiler assistance for execution profiling, profile information describing a sequence of events occurring in the instruction pipeline, the sequence including every event occurring during a profiled execution interval that matches time-independent selection criteria of events to be profiled, the recording continuing until a predetermined stop condition is reached, the profile circuitry further configured to detect the occurrence of a predetermined condition, after a non-profiled interval of execution, and to thereon commence of the profiled execution interval (*see Figure 1, "condition codes are maintained on an X86 machine to*

provide knowledge of the machine state”, col. 2, lines 64-66, “query the condition code”, “conditional branch”, col. 3, lines 4-7, “storing, in response to an execution of a condition code modifying instruction, a first table of methods, the methods providing access to evaluation routines which, when executed, modify one or all of the plurality of condition code bits”, col. 3, lines 50-61, “a profile file data structure 60 used to store information, col. 13, lines 62-67, see Fig. 5, “fields 70 are used to keep track or maintain count of the targets of the control transfer instruction”, “ number of times a conditional control transfer of a branch instruction was taken”, col. 14, lines 64-67 through col. 15, lines 1-3).

It is inherent that Chernoff teaches the profiling to be done without compiler assistance because Chernoff does not disclose using compiler assistance. The various condition codes represent the criteria of events of various machine states, which are predetermined. A specific example, if and only if a condition is met that would allow for information profiling to occur, then information profiling would occur. And vice versa, if and only if that condition is not met, then no information profiling will occur. In addition, the count of number of times a conditional control transfer of a branch institution was taken illustrates that there are time-independent selection criteria of events.

8. Referring to claim 2, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 1:

- the profile circuitry being configured to record at least one physical memory reference noting the source and destination of a control flow event in which control flow of the program execution diverges from sequential execution (“*main memory*”, col. 1, lines 9-

10, *"in memory or within the registers of the new architecture, a set of bits which would be used to emulate the X86 condition codes"*, col. 3, lines 22-29, *"FIG. 22 is a block diagram of a pair of data structures stored in memory which represents a return address stack"*, col. 4, lines 62-65, *"converts instructions from a instruction set of a first, non native computer system to a second, different, native computer system"*, see Abstract).

Chernoff teaches the divergence from sequential execution when it converts instructions from a non native computer system to a native computer system.

9. Referring to claim 3, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 1, wherein:

- the instruction pipeline is configured to execute instructions of an instruction set in which an interpretation of an instruction depends on a processor mode not expressed in a binary representation of the instruction (*"binary translator"*, Fig. 4, *"pipeline instructions and thus execute the application program more quickly and efficiently"*, col. 20, lines 9-11, *"pipelined fashion, executing multiple instructions in parallel"*, col. 19, lines 45-46. Chernoff teaches having a binary translator between two different modes, one with binary code and one without);
- the profile circuitry is configured to record profile information describing at least all events occurring during the profiled execution interval of the two classes: a divergence of execution from sequential execution, and a processor mode change that is not inferable from the opcode of the instruction that induces the processor mode change, the instruction opcode taken together with a processor-mode before the mode change instruction (*"a profile file data structure 60 used to store information, col. 13, lines 62-*

Art Unit: 2127

67, see Fig. 5, "fields 70 are used to keep track or maintain count of the targets of the control transfer instruction", " number of times a conditional control transfer of a branch instruction was taken", col. 14, lines 64-67 through col. 15, lines 1-3, "converts instructions from a instruction set of a first, non native computer system to a second, different, native computer system", see Abstract).

Chernoff teaches the divergence from sequential execution when it converts instructions/opcodes from a non native computer system to a native computer system.

10. Referring to claims 4 and 5, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 3, wherein:
 - the profile circuitry is configured to detect the occurrence of profileable events occurring in the instruction pipeline ("*a profile file data structure 60 used to store information, col. 13, lines 62-67, see Fig. 5, "fields 70 are used to keep track or maintain count of the targets of the control transfer instruction", " number of times a conditional control transfer of a branch instruction was taken", col. 14, lines 64-67 through col. 15, lines 1-3, "pipeline instructions and thus execute the application program more quickly and efficiently", col. 20, lines 9-11, "pipelined fashion, executing multiple instructions in parallel", col. 19, lines 45-46*);
 - to direct the instruction pipeline to record profile information describing the profileable events essentially concurrently with the occurrence of the profileable events, the detecting and recording occurring under hardware control without software intervention ("*pipeline instructions and thus execute the application program more quickly and efficiently", col. 20, lines 9-11, "pipelined fashion, executing multiple instructions in*

Art Unit: 2127

parallel”, col. 19, lines 45-46, see Figure 1, “condition codes are maintained on an X86 machine to provide knowledge of the machine state”, col. 2, lines 64-66, “query the condition code”, “conditional branch”, col. 3, lines 4-7, “storing, in response to an execution of a condition code modifying instruction, a first table of methods, the methods providing access to evaluation routines which, when executed, modify one or all of the plurality of condition code bits”, col. 3, lines 50-61).

Chernoff does not teach using software intervention and does not teach first storing the profile information into main memory.

11. Referring to claims 6 and 27, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 3, wherein the profile circuitry is configured to record profile information efficiently tailored to identify all bytes of object code executed during the profiled interval, without reference to the binary code of the program (*“a profile file data structure 60 used to store information, col. 13, lines 62-67, see Fig. 5, “fields 70 are used to keep track or maintain count of the targets of the control transfer instruction”, “ number of times a conditional control transfer of a branch instruction was taken”, col. 14, lines 64-67 through col. 15, lines 1-3, “converts instructions from a instruction set of a first, non native computer system to a second, different, native computer system”, see Abstract, “The interpreter 44, for each instruction, determines the length or number of bytes comprising the instruction, identifies the opcode portion of the instruction, and determines the resources needed by the instruction.”, col. 12, lines 41-47, “The run-time system collects profile data in response to execution of the native instructions to determine execution characteristics of the non-native instruction. Thereafter, the non-native instructions and the profile statistics are*

Art Unit: 2127

fed to a binary translator”, see Abstract). Chernoff teaches the divergence from sequential execution when it converts instructions/opcodes from a non native computer system to a native computer system.

12. Referring to claim 10, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 1, wherein the program is executed on a computer having:

- an instruction pipeline configured to execute instructions from a memory of the computer (*“pipeline instructions and thus execute the application program more quickly and efficiently”, col. 20, lines 9-11, “pipelined fashion, executing multiple instructions in parallel”, col. 19, lines 45-46*);
- profile circuitry configured to detect the occurrence of profileable events occurring in the instruction pipeline (*“a profile file data structure 60 used to store information, col. 13, lines 62-67, see Fig. 5, “fields 70 are used to keep track or maintain count of the targets of the control transfer instruction”, “ number of times a conditional control transfer of a branch instruction was taken”, col. 14, lines 64-67 through col. 15, lines 1-3, “pipeline instructions and thus execute the application program more quickly and efficiently”, col. 20, lines 9-11, “pipelined fashion, executing multiple instructions in parallel”, col. 19, lines 45-46*);
- to direct the instruction pipeline to record profile information describing the profileable events essentially concurrently with the occurrence of the profileable events, the detecting and recording occurring under hardware control without software intervention (*“pipeline instructions and thus execute the application program more quickly and*

efficiently”, col. 20, lines 9-11, “pipelined fashion, executing multiple instructions in parallel”, col. 19, lines 45-46, see Figure 1, “condition codes are maintained on an X86 machine to provide knowledge of the machine state”, col. 2, lines 64-66, “query the condition code”, “conditional branch”, col. 3, lines 4-7, “storing, in response to an execution of a condition code modifying instruction, a first table of methods, the methods providing access to evaluation routines which, when executed, modify one or all of the plurality of condition code bits”, col. 3, lines 50-61).

Chernoff does not teach using software intervention and does not teach first storing the profile information into main memory.

13. Referring to claim 11, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 5.

14. Referring to claim 14, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 1, wherein the recorded physical memory references include addresses of binary instructions referenced by an instruction pointer, and at least one of the recorded instruction references records the event of a sequential execution flow across a page boundary in the address space (*“first pointer”, “second pointer”, col. 3, lines 50-67 through col. 4, lines 1-8*).

15. Referring to claim 17, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 1, wherein the recorded profile information indicates ranges of instruction binary text executed by the computer during a

Art Unit: 2127

profiled interval of the execution (*see the rejection of claim 1*), but fails to explicitly teach the ranges of executed text being recorded as low and high boundaries of the respective ranges.

However, it is inherent that addresses in memory, which store data in code, are finite and bounded within a range (high boundary and low boundary).

16. Referring to claim 19, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 1, wherein:

- the captured profile information comprises subunits of two kinds, a first subunit kind describing an instruction interpretation mode at an instruction boundary (*"converts instructions from a instruction set of a first, non native computer system to a second, different, native computer system", see Abstract*);
- a second subunit kind describing a transition between processor modes (*"converts instructions from a instruction set of a first, non native computer system to a second, different, native computer system", see Abstract*).

17. Referring to claim 20, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim

3. Applicant uses terminology such as "initiating events" and "non-initiating events" to describe whether an event of this event code is allowed to initiate collection of a new profile packet, or whether this event class may only be recorded in entries after the first. Claim 20 is similar to claim 3 but with different defined terminology by the Applicant. In addition, it is inherent that when a triggering event is detected, a non-triggering event is ignored. Similarly, when a triggering event is detected, an event will be triggered. Furthermore, it is inherent that the

Art Unit: 2127

criteria takes into account both initiating and non-initiating events because the criteria is what distinguishes the event from being initiating or non-initiating.

18. Referring to claim 22, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 1, the profile circuitry being further designed to record an event code describing the class of each profileable event recorded (*"condition codes", col. 2, lines 64-67*).

19. Referring to claim 24, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 1:

- wherein the instruction pipeline is configured to execute instructions of two instruction sets:
 - o a native instruction set providing access to substantially all of the resources of the computer (*"main memory", col. 1, lines 9-10, "in memory or within the registers of the new architecture, a set of bits which would be used to emulate the X86 condition codes", col. 3, lines 22-29, "FIG. 22 is a block diagram of a pair of data structures stored in memory which represents a return address stack", col. 4, lines 62-65, "converts instructions from a instruction set of a first, non native computer system to a second, different, native computer system", see Abstract*);
 - o a non-native instruction set providing access to a subset of the resources of the computer (*"main memory", col. 1, lines 9-10, "in memory or within the registers of the new architecture, a set of bits which would be used to emulate the X86 condition codes", col. 3, lines 22-29, "FIG. 22 is a block diagram of a pair of data structures stored in memory which represents a return address stack", col.*

Art Unit: 2127

4, lines 62-65, "converts instructions from a instruction set of a first, non native computer system to a second, different, native computer system", see Abstract).

20. Referring to claim 25, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim

24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-8, 15-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernoff et al. (hereinafter Chernoff) (US 6,000,028).

21. Referring to claim 7, Chernoff teaches the computer of claim 1, wherein the profile circuitry is configured to record profile information during the profiled execution interval ("*a profile file data structure 60 used to store information, col. 13, lines 62-67, see Fig. 5, "fields 70 are used to keep track or maintain count of the targets of the control transfer instruction", "number of times a conditional control transfer of a branch instruction was taken", col. 14, lines 64-67 through col. 15, lines 1-3*), but fails to explicitly teach:

- identifying each distinct physical page of instruction text executed;

Art Unit: 2127

However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing that each distinct physical page of instruction text executed by identified is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include identifying each distinct physical page of instruction text executed to the existing system for the reason of improving data processing by being able to identify instructions.

22. Referring to claim 8, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 3. In addition, Chernoff teaches wherein the profile circuitry is configured to record profile information during the profiled execution interval (*"a profile file data structure 60 used to store information, col. 13, lines 62-67, see Fig. 5, 'fields 70 are used to keep track or maintain count of the targets of the control transfer instruction', 'number of times a conditional control transfer of a branch instruction was taken', col. 14, lines 64-67 through col. 15, lines 1-3)*), but fails to explicitly teach:

- identifying each distinct physical page of instruction text executed;

However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing that each distinct physical page of instruction text executed by identified is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include identifying each distinct physical page of instruction text executed to the existing system for the reason of improving data processing by being able to identify instructions.

Art Unit: 2127

23. Referring to claim 15, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing that at least one of the recorded instruction references records the event of a page boundary of the address space occurring within a single instruction is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the data instructions point to addresses which store the event of a page boundary to the existing system for the reason of increasing the control of the program by having a method of data allocation.

24. Referring to claim 16, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing that stored data instruction references an address location sequentially adjacent in the logical address space is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include storing data sequentially in the logical address space to the existing system for the reason of increasing the simplicity of data storage allocation. It is a common practice in software to iterate address locations with +1 or -1.

25. Referring to claim 18, Chernoff fails to explicitly teach the computer of claim 17, wherein the profile circuitry is configured to record, as the high boundaries of the respective ranges, the address of the last byte of each respective range. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing that recording/storing can be performed at the high boundary of the range of memory is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this

Art Unit: 2127

feature of storing at the high boundary of the range of memory to the existing system for the reason of improving data allocation by utilizing all the storage capacity available.

26.

Claims 9, 21, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernoff et al. (hereinafter Chernoff) (US 6,000,028) in view of Agrawal et al. (hereinafter Agrawal) (US 5,768,500).

27. Referring to claims 9 and 26, Chernoff fails to explicitly teach wherein the triggering event is expiration of a timer. However, Agrawal discloses that timer interrupts can be used to interrupt the processor when a set threshold is exceeded (*"a hardware timer interrupts the processor when waiting time at a particular address exceeds a preset threshold"*, col. 8, lines 14-19). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of a timer to trigger an event for the reason of improving the control of the system by having interrupts to change states.

28. Referring to claim 21, Chernoff fails to explicitly teach the profile circuitry being further designed to record a timestamp describing a time of the recorded events. However, Agrawal discloses the use of a timestamp data to track the time of events (*"timestamp"*, col. 10, lines 31-43, col. 11, lines 59-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of timestamps for the reason of improving the organization of the system by being able to track the time of particular events, which is important data that can be utilized.

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chernoff et al. (hereinafter Chernoff) (US 6,000,028) in view of Hammond et al. (hereinafter Hammond) (US 5,638,525).

29. Referring to claim 12, Chernoff teaches a multiprocessor computer system (*"synchronization in multiple CPU environments"*, col. 15, lines 57-59) with an instruction pipeline, profile circuitry and trigger but fails to explicitly teach it all belonging to a first CPU of a multiprocessor. However, Hammond discloses using two different instruction sets which use two different processors and architectures (*CISC and RISC processors*, col. 4, lines 50-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use separate processors to store information separately for the reason of increasing efficiency by having similar tasks and data together with one processor, while utilizing the other processor for its resources when needed.

In addition, Chernoff teaches recording profile information in a multiprocessor computer system but fails to explicitly teach using a second CPU of the multiprocessor that is able to coordinate/communicate with a first CPU of the multiprocessor. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing that a multiprocessor/parallel computer system can coordinate with one processor to another is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this feature of at least partially coordinating the operation of the first CPU based at least in part on the analysis of the collected profile data to the existing system for the reason of

Art Unit: 2127

increasing efficiency by having the similar tasks and data together contained in one processor utilized with the other processor for its resources so they can be accessed or analyzed.

30. Referring to claim 13, Chernoff in view of Hammond teaches the use of a first CPU and a second CPU but fails to explicitly teach wherein the controlling is effected by altering the text of the program executed by the first CPU. However, "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing that control be done by altering the text of a program is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the feature of controlling effected by altering the text of the program executed by the first CPU to the existing system for the reason of increasing the control of the system. Having text would be how instructions would be relayed to the first CPU.

Allowable Subject Matter

31. Claim 23 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The current prior art fails to explicitly teach wherein a number of bits used to record the event code is less than \log_2 of the number of distinguished event classes.

Art Unit: 2127

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (703) 305-5334. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

kt
June 11, 2003


MAJD A. BANANKHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER